

REMARKS

In response to the Office Action (Restriction) dated June 11, 2008, Applicant elects Group II, directed to claims 8-18, with traverse. In addition, Applicant has amended claim 2, *supra*, to correct a typographical error. Applicant respectfully solicits reconsideration and withdrawal of the Restriction requirement in view of the arguments presented below.

Traversal of Restriction Requirement

The Office Action provides Blake (US 4,429,693) as presumably disclosing the claimed features of the present invention. Further, the Office Action on page 2 recites, “the limitation of a flexible bag with two plates for supporting the bag and a spring put between the two plates does not provide a contribution over the prior art, and no single general inventive concept exists”.

Applicant submits that Groups I and II share a general inventive concept under PCT Rules 13.1 and 13.2 because both Groups share a special technical feature defining a contribution over the prior art. In the present invention, independent claims 1 and 8 recite a lock and lock body, respectively. This special technical feature provides disengagement of hooks, 10 and 11, so as to release the compressed spring by a force acting upon the lock member without moving the two plates. The present invention overcomes shortcomings in the prior art such relating to premature disengagement of the locking member.

In contrast, Blake does not teach or suggest a lock wherein the lock member is different from the plates, 10a and 10b. Further, latch hooks, 35a and 35b, of the latch, 35, (i.e., locking member) extends from the interior sections of plates, 10a and 10b. See col. 7, lines 52-64. The latch hooks are disengaged by moving plates 10a and 10b and bending the wing plates, 18, upward. See col. 7, lines 65-68. Because the prior art disengages the locking members by moving the plates, the present invention is patentably distinguishable thereover. Thus, Groups 1 and 2 illustrate a special technical feature that defines a contribution over the prior art cited. As such, Applicant kindly requests withdrawal and reconsideration of the Restriction requirement.


Conclusion

It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

It is not believed that extensions of time are required, beyond those that may otherwise be provided for in accompanying documents. However, in the event that additional extensions of time are necessary to prevent abandonment of this application, then such extensions of time are hereby petitioned under 37 C.F.R. 1.136(a), and any fees required therefore are hereby authorized to be charged to Deposit Account No. 02-4300, Attorney Docket No. 033036.089.

Respectfully submitted,

SMITH, GAMBRELL & RUSSELL, LLP

For By:  REG. 58,402.
Robert G. Weilacher, Reg. No. 20,531
1230 Peachtree Street, N.E.
Suite 3100, Promenade II
Atlanta, GA 30309-3592
P: (404) 815-3593
F: (404) 685-6893

RGW/TBP/lhb

Dated: September 11, 2008